

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Jason Busby, #45926,)	
)	Civil Action Number: 9:08-3374-HMH-BM
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Curtis Bufford, official and individual)	
capacities,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
)	
Eric Anthony Brown, #74342,)	Civil Action Number: 4:08-3473-HFF-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Lt. Curtis Bufford and Officer Kevin)	
Williams, in their official and individual)	
capacities,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
)	
Wilbert D. Guider, #110461,)	Civil Action Number: 9:08-3474-RBH-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Kevin Williams and Curtis Bufford,)	
individual and official capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Herbert Scott, Jr., #46068,

Plaintiff,

v.

Curtis Bufford and Harold Walker,
official and individual capacities,

Defendants.

)
) Civil Action Number: 8:08-3523-RBH-BHH
)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

Dennis Lavern Jacobs, #54591,

Plaintiff,

v.

Curtis Bufford and Kevin Williams,
official and individual capacities,

Defendants.

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

The Plaintiffs in the above entitled actions,¹ all current or former inmates at Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center, have filed these civil actions pursuant to the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that the defendant prison officials have abridged their constitutional rights. The Plaintiffs allege that they were served grits out of a pot containing a baby snake, which one inmate discovered on his plate. The Defendants have filed a motion for consolidation in each of the actions listed above. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) provides that, “[i]f

¹The Defendants’ motion to consolidate was denied by separate orders in the following actions because they contained additional claims, Sweat v. Walker, 9:08-3095-HFF-BM, Frierson v. Walker, 2:08-3298-RBH-RSC, Green v. Bufford, 0:08-3323-GRA-PLG. In addition, Johnson v. Bufford, 8:08-3529-HFF, was dismissed for failure to prosecute.

actions before the court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may: . . . (2) consolidate the actions.” “Judicial economy generally favors consolidation . . . but the Court must conduct a careful inquiry in this regard that balances the prejudice and confusion that consolidation might entail against the waste of resources, the burden on the parties, and the risk of inconsistent judgments that separate proceedings could engender.” In re Orbital Sciences Corp. Secs. Litig., 188 F.R.D. 237, 238 (E.D. Va. 1999) (citing Arnold v. Eastern Air Lines, Inc., 681 F.2d 186, 193 (4th Cir. 1982)). After careful consideration, the court finds that these complaints contain many common questions of fact and law and the Plaintiffs will suffer no prejudice as a result of consolidation. Therefore, the court finds that the cases should be consolidated for disposition. All actions should be assigned to the undersigned and referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for consideration.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

July 22, 2009
Greenville, South Carolina